

Architectural and Site Control Commission **September 23, 2013**
Special Site Meeting, 5 Naranja Way, Maffia, and
Regular Evening ASCC Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Breen called the special site meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. at 5 Naranja Way.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Koch, Ross

Absent: Hughes

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlasic, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson,
Assistant Planner Borck

Others* present relative to the 5 Naranja Way applications:

Mike Maffia, applicant

Jeremy Butler-Pinkham, project architect

Kate Stickley, project landscape architect

Hon-Cheong Lee, project civil engineer

Dana Parsons, 167 Mapache

Linda Yates and Paul Holland, 170 Mapache Drive

Tom Klope, landscape architect for Linda Yates and Paul Holland

Mary and Patrick Enright, 171 Mapache Drive (Mr. Enright arrived toward the end of the site meeting.)

Alison Wells, 15 Naranja Way

Loverine Taylor, 35 Naranja Way

Adrienne Roberts, 20 Naranja Way

Rusty Day, Bev Lipman, Westridge Architectural Supervising Committee (WASC)

*Others may have been present during the course of the site meeting but did not formally identify themselves for the record.

Continued Architectural Review for new residence with detached office, pool and pool cabana, and Site Development Permit X9H-657, 5 Naranja way, Maffia

Vlasic presented the September 19, 2013 staff report and discussed the plan revisions made in response to the comments offered at the August 27, 2013 preliminary project review meetings. He made use of a composite plan showing the revised site plan for 5 Naranja Way with the site plan for the northern parcel, i.e., 170 Mapache Drive. He noted that the composite plan included house and yard improvements and also grading and “developed” ground elevation points. Vlasic advised that since the September 19, 2013 staff report was prepared the following data had been provided to the town and ASCC members:

- September 19, 2013 email communication from the WASC to the project architect.
- September 20, 2013 response to WASC communication from the project architect.
- September 18 and September 20, 2013 communications from town consulting civil engineers NV5 provided further review of the revised grading and drainage plans and conditional approval of the plans.
- September 17, 2013 town geologist review and approval of revised grading and drainage plans.

Vlasic noted that the second site meeting allowed for the ASCC, site neighbors and others interested in the project to better appreciate the plan revisions and supporting data developed since the August 27, 2013 preliminary review meeting.

ASCC members considered the staff report, data provided to them after distribution of the staff report and the following plans unless otherwise noted dated September 12, 2013 and prepared by BAR Architects:

Title Sheet (with house and garage perspective rendering)
Sheet G0.01, General Information
Sheet G0.02, GreenPoint Rated Checklist (Main House)
Sheet G0.03, GreenPoint Rated Checklist (Office)
Sheet R1.00, Topographic Survey/Tree Survey Map, L. Wade Hammond

Civil Plans, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., Civil Engineers, 9/12/13:

Sheet C01, Grading & Drainage Plan (with septic data)
Sheet C-02, Erosion Control Plan
Sheet DT01, Detail Sheet
Sheet DT02, Detail Sheet

Landscape Plans, Arterra Landscape Architects, 9/12/13:

Sheet L1.0, Tree Protection and Removal Plan, Ned Patchett Consulting
Sheet L3.0, Planting Plan
Sheet L5.0, Exterior Lighting Plan

Architectural Plans, Bar Architects, 9/12/13:

Sheet A1.00, Overall Site Plan and Project Information
Sheet A1.01, Site Plan
Sheet A1.51, Main House Overall Floor Plan
Sheet A1.51, Accessory Structure Overall Floor and Roof Plans
Sheet A1.53, Main House Overall Roof Plan
Sheet A3.01, Main House Exterior Elevations
Sheet A3.02, Main House Exterior Elevations
Sheet A3.03, Accessory Structure Exterior Elevations
Sheet A3.21, Main House Building Sections
Sheet A3.22, Main House Building Sections
Sheet A3.23, Main House Building Sections
Sheet A3.24, Main House Building Sections
Sheet A3.25, Accessory Structures Building Sections

Also available for reference were the following application materials:

- September 17, 2013 letter from the project architect describing the plan revisions made since the original plan submittal and, particularly, since the August 27, 2013 preliminary review meetings.
- Preliminary Drainage Analysis, Freyer & Laureta, Inc., received by email 9/12/13.
- "Drainage Narrative," Freyer & Laureta, Inc., received by email 9/17/13.
- September 17, 2013 memo from project arborist Ned Patchett commenting on the condition of the two large pines along the northerly boundary and partially responding to comments in the September 12, 2013 email from Linda Yates with 9/9/13 letter from Michael P. Young, Urban Tree Management.
- Cut sheets for the proposed exterior light fixtures received June 17, 2013.
- Colors and materials board, BAR Architects, 6/17/13.
- Arborist's report, Ned Patchett, Certified Arborist, June 28, 2013.

Mr. Maffia and the project design team members explained the plan revisions and referenced the modifications to the story poles and outline taping made since the August

27th meeting. The led all present on an inspection of the site and offered the following comments during the course of the inspection:

- The story poles and taping were reset to model the changes to the pool and related terraces and also the pool cabana. They were not, however, modified relative to the 1 to 2-foot adjustment of the main house and garage buildings away from the northern property line.
- Both large north side pines are now to be removed due to their condition, and new planting of very large size oaks and other materials are planned to ensure a long-term screening solution.
- Details were offered relative to the plan for screen planting along the northerly property line. It was also clarified that the landscape plans call for growing of vines on the proposed stone veneer pool house walls.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the existing fencing that extends into the site just north of the proposed pool house will be “moved” to the property line. This will either be done using the existing fence materials or new materials to match the approximately four-foot high existing post, rail and wire fencing.
- In response to questions regarding the drainage plans, it was noted that the proposed system would collect storm water that flows onto the site and the storm water from the new impervious surfaces, store the water in the proposed 30-inch pipes and “bioswale” detention basins, and then “meter” the stored water out through smaller pipes and over rock dissipaters to the public drainage facilities at Mapache Drive. Mr. Lee advised that the drainage calculations show that the system will accommodate all anticipated flow and discharge storm waters off site in a more controlled manner with less intensity than existing conditions. He clarified that these calculations had been reviewed and found acceptable by the town’s engineering consultant.
- In response to a question regarding the condition of 18-inch oak #59, i.e., the oak located just to the north of the proposed pool cabana, it was noted that the tree was not in good condition and that the project arborist has advised that removal of the tree should be considered. It was also clarified that the current tree plan does not propose the tree to be removed and that efforts would continue to enhance its condition.

After inspection of conditions on site, field meeting attendees viewed conditions from locations on the south side of the Holland/Yates property to the areas of the proposed development. During this review, Tom Klope offered the following comments on behalf of his clients for ASCC consideration:

- The more distant views from the upper, south side lawn area at the Holland/Yates property are critical to the entire house experience. The desire is to screen views from this lawn area to the ridge of the proposed garage structure but not block the more distant views. In time, the proposed live oaks will significantly impact the distant views and other landscape materials should be considered. For example, 72-inch box size Arbutus trees with other understory plantings were recommended. This approach would provide the necessary screening but would not eliminate the longer distance views.
- While the concern over the long-term health/viability of the two large pines is appreciated, loss of both now would create a significant screening issue that could not

be mitigated in the short term. Thus, it is requested that pine #64 be preserved for screening. There is the chance that the tree could survive for a relatively long period, i.e., 5-10 years, and this would at least permit time for other screen plant materials to grow.

- There are currently redwoods south of the Holland/Yates spa. Perhaps some additional redwoods could be added to screen views to and from the proposed lanai and BBQ terrace and the spa area.

Following the consideration of view and other relationships with the Holland/Yates property, field trip attendees returned to the proposed office site at 5 Naranja Way. The changes to siting for the office were discussed and the story poles considered. In response to a question, it was noted that the tree removal plan did propose removal of all pines at the southernmost corner of the site.

Rusty Day asked if the final office siting was in conformity with the WASC's setback requirements from public street rights-of-way, street centerlines, and trail easements? He clarified that structures had to be at least 50 feet from a street right of way line or bridal path easement line and at least 100 feet from the centerline of any street. The plans were checked and it appeared that some adjustment might be needed to meet all of these setback requirements. Design team members noted, however, that they would review the matter further and ensure setbacks are met with final plans.

During the course of the site meeting public comments were requested and the following offered:

Dana Parsons noted that he was concerned with the opening of views to the office site and the proposed planting around the office site was discussed.

Mary and Patrick Enright asked for clarifications relative to the drainage plans and these were offered (see above comments from the project civil engineer).

(Relative to drainage, Vlasic advised that he would be seeking a better, more understandable description of the proposed drainage system found acceptable by the town's engineering consultant. He noted that this should also be responsive to the comments in the 9/17 report from the project arborist and should be prepared so it was available for information at the time of the planning commission public hearing on the site development permit.)

Rusty Day advised that the WASC is prepared to issue an approval for the project with three conditions and two observations. The three conditions are:

1. All current curb cuts and access points from Mapache Drive shall be eliminated and there shall be no new access from Mapache Drive.
2. A detailed construction staging plan with construction timeline shall be provided that addresses timely project construction and ensures construction staging, parking, and storage is maintained on the property,
3. The office structure shall conform to the WASC setback requirements (as stated above).

The WASC observations are:

1. Consideration should be given to placing more fill in the proposed drainage swale along the north side of the property. The final design should be more of a gentle swale than a trough.
2. The applicant's drainage plans are laudable and appear to offer significant improvements to the drainage conditions, particularly relative to the issues associated with water flowing from the property to Mapache Drive. At the same time, the overall area drainage problems need attention from neighbors and the town and these are beyond those that are the responsibility of the applicant.

ASCC members concurred that they would offer comments on the project during the continued review at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Thereafter, Breen thanked all present for the participation in the field meeting and project consideration was continued to the regular evening ASCC meeting.

Adjournment

The special site meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Architectural and Site Control Commission **September 23, 2013**
Regular Evening Meeting, 765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, California

Chair Breen called the regular meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Town Center historic School House meeting room.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Breen, Clark, Koch, Ross

Absent: Hughes

Planning Commission Liaison: Von Feldt

Town Council Liaison: Wengert

Town Staff: Town Planner Vlastic, Deputy Town Planner Kristiansson,
Assistant Planner Borck

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Continued Architectural Review for new residence with detached office, pool and pool cabana, and Site Development Permit X9H-657, 5 Naranja way, Maffia

Vlastic presented the September 19, 2013 staff report on this continuing project review. He discussed the events of the afternoon site meeting and input received at the site meeting, including that of the WASC relative to its conditional approval of the revised plans. (Refer to above site meeting minutes for a summary of the site meeting consideration. The site meeting minutes include a complete listing of review project plans and materials.)

Vlastic clarified that the matters before the ASCC this evening were to, if possible, complete action on the architectural review proposal and forward comments to the planning commission relative to the site, grading, drainage and landscape plans. He advised that the planning commission would take into account ASCC actions and recommendations during its public hearing on the site development permit application. Vlastic reiterated that he would be seeking from the project and town civil engineers a better description of the proposed drainage system for consideration during the planning commission public hearing process.

Mike Maffia, applicant, Jeremy Butler-Pinkham, project architect, Kate Stickley, project landscape architect, and Hon-Cheong Lee, project civil engineer, were present and offered the following comments, largely in response to questions and comments offered at the site meeting.

- The drainage system description will be provided as requested.
- Pine #64 that the neighbors have requested be saved has been considered by the project arborist and discussed with the neighbor's arborist. The most recent consideration and findings by the project arborist are set forth in his September 17, 2013 report and recommend tree replacement due to beetle infestation and a conclusion that the two pine trees would likely "require removal within the next few years." "We" are willing to consider some of the landscape plan adjustments suggested by Mr. Klope, including use of redwoods for screening between the neighbors spa and the proposed lanai area, but still conclude that the use of some larger live oaks is appropriate, particularly for screening of views up to the house improvements on 170 Mapache Drive.

- There is some concern over the use of Arbutus trees recommended by Mr. Klope. There has been some issue with a fungus that makes use of the arbutus questionable and, in any case, if healthy, they do grow to heights of 40 feet or more and would still block views of concern to the neighbors.
- In response to a question regarding the terrace lawn areas, it was noted that the project plans had been evaluated under the town's mandatory water efficiency calculation provisions and that with the proposed the lawn area the calculations demonstrated compliance with town water efficiency requirements.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the locations for any required utility meter boxes, etc., had yet to be identified, but would be noted in final plan sheets after consultation with utility providers.
- In response to a question, it was noted that pool lighting had yet to be specified.
- The comments in the September 17, 2013 letter from the project architect were reviewed relative to the revised lighting plans and, in particular, the changes made to the clerestory features to mitigate potential for light spill.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the detached "office" is for personal home use and a retreat and not a business office.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the only project fencing is the changes to the north side existing fencing explained at the afternoon site meeting.

Public comments were requested and the following offered.

Bev Lipman, WASC, advised that the committee had reached a position on the project as presented by Mr. Day at the afternoon site meeting.

Joy Somersett, 177 Mapache Drive, reviewed the history of drainage issues in the area and expressed concern over any changes that would increase runoff to Mapache Drive and toward her property.

(Vlasic reiterated the above comments relative to the drainage plans and town engineering approval of them and also the comment about a more understandable drainage plan description for the site development permit hearing process. Ross commented that the final drainage system description should, in particular, make the "metering" part of the system very clear.)

Linda Yates, 170 Mapache Drive, referred to an email from Tom Klope setting forth comments on the proposed landscape plan. She also offered the following reactions to the comments provided by the project design team:

- Arbutus trees were planted on "their" property to screen views for the uphill neighbor. These were 72-inch box trees and there has been no fungus issue with them. They don't grow to excessive heights and would work to accomplish the screening as described by Mr. Klope.
- The width of the branches of pine #64 are essential to adequate screening and need to be preserved at least for as long as possible. This screening can't be replaced for a long time with any new plantings.

- Appropriate and adequate plantings as suggested by Mr. Klope are essential to ensure privacy and minimize potential impacts of noise and light spill and visual relationships.
- As neighbors, “we” have no control over plant placement and if oaks are used they will shade a demonstration garden that has been installed at the eastern corner of “our” property.

Paul Holland, 170 Mapache Drive, offered the following comments and concerns:

- Concerns in his previous communications to the town were reiterated. He stressed that nowhere else in Westridge is “95% of a house project” at a parcel quadrant hard up against the neighboring parcel and that this project forces over “200 linear feet” along and within 10 feet of the required setback line from the property line common with his property. He requested a formal response to the precedent setting nature of this situation.
- There is no voice for the neighbors in this process. “We” have requested a “full scale site model” of the garage so that “we” can develop defensive strategies to the project. No one has responded to “our” concerns.
- The project should be moved further to the south and away from “our” property. “We” did everything “we” were asked to do when with “our” project and “we” are asking that this applicant to be held to the same standards required of “us.” “What have we done wrong” to be “ignored?”
- This has been a terrible experience for “us” and “we” will do all “we” can “to defend our property.”

Project architect Jeremy Butler-Pinkham advised that in response to the neighbor concerns, a number of changes had been made to the project including height, setback, and pool area changes as recorded in the various letters with the project submittals. He also noted that with the changes, the length of the house and garage elements are 82 feet and 42 feet, for a total of 125 feet and not 200 feet.

Vlasic advised that, in direct response to the comments of the neighbors and their request, the staff report includes the recommendation that any action on the plans be conditioned to require site modeling of the garage, house, and clerestory areas so that new screen planting can be installed with this modeling in place to ensure the planting is specifically located to address the concerns of the neighbors. He also advised that appropriate site plans and placement of development is, pursuant to town standards and guidelines, unique to each site and its specific conditions. He noted that while setbacks are a factor, topography, tree cover, slope stability, drainage and relationships to streets, and adjoining development are also significant factors. He noted that an analysis to determine how many properties in Westridge have “linear” development along a setback line, and how long such development is, would have little influence on a project review unless all of the other important site factors are also analyzed along with the setback matter.

ASCC members then commented on the revised proposal as follows:

Ross:

- The revisions are a positive response to the preliminary review comments.

- The options for project siting are constrained by a number of factors including slope, drainage, and the neighboring development. In this case, the proposed siting “makes sense” taking into account all of these factors.
- Don’t see anything “disrespectful” of the approach, particularly with the single story design.
- While the new garage roof will have some presence on views from the neighboring upper lawn area and house, it would be less than is the case with the roof of the existing barn.
- Agree that coast live oaks may not be correct screening choice due to potential for long-term view impacts. Whatever is planted above the garage should not grow too tall, but be of sufficient height to screen views to the garage roof and ridgeline.
- Removal of the pines will open more distant views from the neighboring property. Further, does support removal of the two larger pines now with appropriate new screen planting early in the process of new site development.
- The project design is sensitive to light spill and the architecture and proposed materials and finishes are appropriate.
- The drainage plan will result in a significant improvement over existing area conditions and the house siting needs to be kept away from the necessary drainage areas and improvements.
- Overall the site plan is a very good response to all of the factors that impact design choices for the site and area. Further, the office siting and location are appropriate subject to comments from the WASC.

Clark:

- Very supportive of the single story design and project siting, including the 30 to 34-foot separation from the northern property line.
- Finds the revised plans for the pool and cabana area responsive to the preliminary review comments and appropriate for the site.
- The WASC comments are appropriate.
- Supports the proposed drainage solution.
- Pine #64 should be retained for now and this will mean that the proposed drainage line along the north side of the site will need to be moved as close to the proposed buildings as possible to avoid potential impacts on the pine and also the needed additional north side screen landscaping.
- The revised lighting plans appear acceptable subject to the conditions identified in the staff report.
- Live oaks should be eliminated in the northeast corner as recommended by Mr. Klope and an alternative plan for screen planting in this area developed.
- Based on the final landscape plan that is acceptable to the ASCC, new north side screen landscaping should be installed as soon as possible and even before site grading if that is possible.

Koch:

- Very surprised to visit the site and view the existing south side house cut into the hillside with its tall elevation. This is not the type of development our current design guidelines would encourage.
- The proposed siting is the correct placement for the house and related improvements. The siting reflects site conditions, including slope and drainage factors, and every project needs to be looked at in terms of specific site conditions.
- Pine #64 is very important to screen views for the neighbors and should be preserved for now and as long as possible. If it does not survive then an alternative plan for screening can be developed.

- The final lighting plan needs to address the comments in the staff report and also detail the proposed pool lighting.
- Consideration should be given to the use of willows in the drainage course areas. Arbutus trees may not be the right choice for screening, but she is sensitive to the concerns identified by Mr. Klope.

Breen:

- Supports the revised plans and drainage system solution and most of the comments offered by others. The critical factor in the long-term success of the project is the right screen landscaping plan.
- Supports keeping pine #64 due to its importance to screening for now.
- Supports the basic mix of proposed plants, but the live oaks are not a good solution at the northeast corner and along the easterly property line. The neighbor concerns should be considered while developing a new, revised landscape plan. Redwoods could be used for screening as suggested at the site meeting.
- The final landscape plan should not include plantings that would interrupt the “feeling” of “pasture” extending from the Wells property to the subject site.
- Somewhat concerned with the “sharp edge” forms for the west side terraces, but the wall materials and location of the features means they will not have any significant potential for off site view impacts.

Following discussion, Clark moved, seconded by Ross and passed 4-0 to approve the architectural review application, and recommend planning commission approval of the site development permit application as shown on the revised plan package listed in the staff report and clarified at the ASCC meeting. The architectural approval was granted subject to the following conditions to be addressed, unless otherwise noted, to the satisfaction of the ASCC prior to issuance of a building permit.

1. The landscape plan shall be revised to provide for preservation of pine #64 and the project arborist shall advise on actions needed to ensure, to the extent feasible, long term tree health. In addition to pine tree preservation, the other comments and concerns of ASCC members shall be addressed with the revised landscape plan.
2. The project development schedule shall be subject to review and approval and shall include provision for planting of north side screen landscaping as soon as possible. Once installed, the plantings shall be maintained and protected from construction impacts so that screen landscaping is in place and established prior to house occupancy.
3. The north side screen landscaping shall be installed under the direction of a designated ASCC member and the town planner, as provided for in the final approved construction schedule. To facilitate placement of materials, there shall be sufficient “mock-up” of the garage and north side house elevations to ensure that the new trees and plantings are located for maximum screening of sensitive view relationships. Further, the mock-up shall include identification of the east side great room clerestory windows so these too can be considered for screening with the new planting. The north side neighbors shall be informed of the plant installation process and given an opportunity to offer input on it, although oversight of plant installation shall be the responsibility of the designated ASCC member.
4. Plans details for the north side fencing adjustments shall be provided.
5. A detailed construction staging and vegetation protection plan shall be provided and, once approved, implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff.

6. A final lighting plan shall be provided that addresses the concerns noted in the staff report, including those related to interior clerestory area lighting, and also clarifies pool lighting. The plan shall verify control of clerestory lighting as committed to in the September 17, 2013 letter from the project architect. The final lighting plan shall include switching patterns for all exterior lighting and shall have a timer to ensure any lighting for the pathway to the office is only on for a short period of time.

ASCC members noted that the approval was granted with the understanding that the conditions of the WASC would also be met.

Architectural Review for residential additions with new detached garage and modifications to driveway access, 1305 Westridge Drive, Hirsh-Long

Kristiansson presented the September 19, 2013 staff report on this request for approval of an addition to the existing house, a new detached garage, and relocated driveway on the subject 1.2-acre Westridge Drive property. She explained that in 2008, the ASCC approved a larger project for this site, which included a very similar addition and detached garage. She clarified that the first phase of work had been completed consistent with approved plans and that the applicant is now prepared to complete work at the front of the house as a second phase.

Kristiansson advised that in 2008 the ASCC made findings to permit concentration of 96% of the allowed floor area in the main structure, and that these findings would need to be considered and made again with any action on the current application. She noted that, as evaluated in the staff report, it appears that the findings can again be made.

Kristiansson then reviewed the few issues discussed in the staff report including landscaping, fencing, and the need for an arborist report. She also referenced a September 20, 2013 letter from the neighbor at 1315 Westridge Drive offering comments on the project and proposed plans.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the following project plans dated 8/20/13 and prepared by CJW Architecture unless otherwise noted:

- Sheet T-0.1, Title Sheet
- Sheet T-0.4, Build It Green Checklist
- Sheet A-1.1, Site Plan
- Sheet A-1.2, Staging Site Plan, Tree Protection Plan, Erosion Control Plan
- Sheet A-2.1, Floor Plan
- Sheet A-2.2, Roof & Dimension Plan
- Sheet A-3.1, Exterior Elevations

It was noted that the parcel is not within the Westridge subdivision area, and therefore the Westridge Homeowners' Association is not involved with the project review.

Mr. Hirsh and project architect Carter Warr presented the plans to the ASCC. The following clarifications were offered, particularly with respect to comments in the letter from the neighbor at 1315 Westridge Drive:

- A plan sheet dated 8/20/13 with photographs and a letter was provided in response to the neighbor concerns. It was explained how light spill was being contained and it was also clarified that given site conditions, headlight penetration to the neighbor was not an issue. It was noted that an enclosure would be provided for the trash area and that the existing west

side yard fence could be extended to the front setback line to further screen views between properties.

- A landscape plan would be provided for the area in front of the garage and an arborist report will be provided as requested in the staff report.
- The request is to keep the existing fence design and not replace where it will not be impacted by the proposed work. In response to questions, it was noted that the new fence sections would match the design of the existing fence, but that the pickets would be spaced to be consistent with the 50% opacity standard. It was also noted that the fence and new gate and entry columns would be consistent with the four foot height limit and that there would be no lights on the proposed columns.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered.

ASCC members discussed the project and found it generally acceptable as proposed. After consideration of neighbor comments, staff report issues and the clarifications offered at the site meeting, Ross moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0 approval of the proposed plans and supporting information subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit, unless otherwise noted:

1. An updated arborist report shall be provided for the trees in the front portion of the yard and shall set forth measures for tree protection and long term preservation.
2. A landscape plan shall be prepared for the front yard, particularly for the area between the new garage and Westridge Drive, to help soften views to the garage and provide some relief between the garage and new flagstone parking area. The landscape plan shall include fence details and shall be to the satisfaction of a designated member of the ASCC.
3. New fencing shall match the existing four-foot high grapestake fencing, but the stakes shall be spaced to conform to the 50% opacity standards of the fence ordinance. Further, consideration shall be given to angling the new fencing section across the existing driveway back from the southwesterly property corner to the new driveway entry gate.

Consideration may also be given to extending the westerly property line fence to the front setback line for added screening between properties.

Architectural Review of proposed temporary construction tent, 50 Pine Ridge Way, Gilbert

Vlasic presented the September 19, 2013 staff report on this request for approval to allow the temporary installation of a construction tent at the subject site. Vlasic advised that while there were some technical issues relative to drainage and tent tie-down, that would need to be addressed to the satisfaction of town engineering staff, the main issue for ASCC consideration was the proposed tent color.

ASCC members considered the staff report and the subject request as described in the attached August 30, 2013 memorandum to the town from project architect, Marc Lindsell and shown on the following plans prepared by 2M Architecture, dated August 30, 2013:

Sheet G-0.0, Cover Sheet
Sheet A-1.1, Site Plan
Sheet A-1.2, Roof Plan

Sheet A-2.1, Exterior Elevations (East & West)
Sheet A-2.2, North & South Elevations

Mr. Gilbert, applicant, and Mr. Lindsell, project architect, presented the proposal to the ASCC. They offered the following clarifications:

- Product information for the proposed *Americover* “Shrink Wrap” tent material was provided. It was noted that the material was available in three colors; white, clear and blue. A sample of the white material was available for consideration.
- The project contractor has had experience with the white material, but not the others. The experience has been good and has allowed sufficient light into the covered work area to allow construction to proceed during the wet season. The same would be the case with the clear material with less light penetration anticipated with the dark blue plastic wrap.
- The proposal has been shared with neighbors and the emphasis has been to ensure project work continues in a timely manner to limit the time neighbors have to experience the construction process. There has not been any negative neighbor response.
- The cover would be in place during the wet season from approximately mid October 2013 until at least February 2014. The cover will permit the construction process to proceed and also avoid the hazardous associated with workers walking on construction surfaces that become slick when wet.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the applicant is committed to ensure the plastic tent material will be recycled. Mr. Gilbert stressed the sustainable goals of the project and efforts completed to date. He noted that a large pine tree had been cut and milled and the wood from the milling given to Habitat for Humanity for reuse in a new affordable housing project.

Public comments were requested, but none offered.

ASCC members discussed the proposal and found it generally acceptable. Members stated a preference for the clear “tent” material or, as a second choice, the white material. It was understood that the clear material would be used unless it was determine to not have the same performance standards as the white material.

Following discussion, and consideration of project clarifications and comments in the staff report, Ross moved, seconded by Koch and passed 4-0 approval of the temporary construction tent request subject to the following conditions:

1. The clear “tent” Shrink Wrap material shall be used unless is found to have inferior performance standards to the white material. If the decision is made to use the white material, prior to installation the applicant shall provide data to the satisfaction of planning staff advising of the concerns and issues with the clear material.
2. The tent once installed may remain in place without further ASCC consideration until the end of March 2014. If a longer period of time is desired, the request shall be made to the ASCC prior to the end of March and may be approved by the ASCC for a specific additional period of time if there have been no issues with the temporary tent.

3. Prior to tent installation, provisions for storm water runoff and tent tie-down shall be identified to the satisfaction of the public works director.
4. Prior to tent installation, the plans shall be referred to the fire marshal for review and comment and any fire marshal concerns shall be addressed.
5. Prior to tent installation, the plans for recycling of the tent materials shall be provided to the satisfaction of planning staff.

Commission and Staff Reports

Kristiansson reported on ongoing staff review of concerns relative to potential light spill from clerestory and skylight areas for a project at 231 Canyon Drive. It was noted that the specifics of the project were not before the ASCC for discussion, as Ross is an immediate neighbor and would be conflicted from such discussion. It was, however, clarified that the project did not require ASCC consideration and that current town design guidelines do not address interior lighting or potential for exterior light spill from such architectural features.

After brief discussion of the procedures for modifications of the design guidelines, ASCC members asked staff to report back to the ASCC on the process to be pursued to modify the guidelines relative to the light spill issue. It was noted that this has been a sensitive design review concern for projects that do require ASCC review and approval and should be a review matter for all projects whether or not ASCC consideration is required.

Minutes

Clark moved, seconded by Ross, and passed 4-0 approval of the September 9, 2013 meeting as drafted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

T. Vlasic